

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed on September 14, 2009. Applicant respectfully requests consideration of the foregoing amendment in light of the following remarks.

Summary of the Office Action

In the Office Action of April 14, 2009, claims 1-5 and 8-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0014368 to Leurig (hereinafter referred to as "Leurig") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0172148 to Simpson (hereinafter referred to as "Simpson"). No other issues were raised.

Status of the Application

Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1, 8 and 13 will have been amended. Accordingly, claims 1-5 and 8-17 remain pending in the application.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of Claims 1-5 and 8-17 over Leurig and Simpson

Claims 1-5 and 8-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Leurig and Simpson (*see, e.g.*, pages 2-10 of Office Action). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 is patentable over the teachings of Leurig and Simpson, because neither of the references teaches or suggests a method executed by a server capable of communicating with a client device and a printer device through a

network, the client device being different from the printer device, the method comprising:

“receiving a printing request from the client device;

transmitting print data to the printer device selected in the client device in accordance with the received printing request;

transmitting, to the client device, address information for causing the client device to acquire, from the printer device without going through the server, a state of processing of the transmitted print data, and

causing the client device to display the state automatically in accordance with the address information” (emphasis added), as recited in the claim.

Embodiments of the method as claimed may thus allow a client device to acquire the state of processing of the transmitted print data from the printer device without going through the server, and without requiring any prior registration of the address information of the printer by a user, since the address information (e.g., an address of a web page for receiving print status information from the printer) is transmitted to the client device by the server (*see, e.g.*, paragraph [0055] of publication of instant application). The state of processing of the transmitted print data is then caused to be automatically displayed on the client device (*see, e.g.* Fig. 6 and paragraphs [0055]-[0056] of the publication of the instant application). Embodiments of the method as claimed may thus reduce the workload on a server, because the server is not required to transmit the state of printing to the client device. Also, the user may be able to confirm the state of processing of the transmitted data without requiring the performance of further operations, because the client device is caused to automatically display the printing state.

The method of claim 1 is patentable over the teachings of Leurig, because Leurig does not teach or suggest a method in which address information is transmitted to a client device to cause the client device to acquire a printing state from a printer device without going through a server, and also does not teach or suggest a method in which the client device is caused to automatically display the state in accordance with the transmitted address information. That Leurig fails to teach or suggest steps in the claimed method is even admitted in the Office Action, which states that “Leurig does not disclose transmitting to the client device address information for get[ting] the state of the print data” (Office Action page 3, third full paragraph).

Leurig teaches a secure system for printing negotiable instruments using a central server that authorizes the printing (*see, e.g.*, Abstract). Leurig teaches that a client computer 108 communicates with a printer to print the negotiable instrument, and that “[a]fter printing is complete, printer 110 provides a status response (step 322) to client system 108” (lines 9-11 of paragraph [0048]). Thus, as was discussed in the previous Response submitted on August 13, 2009 as well as in the interview with the Examiner prior thereto on August 12, 2009, Leurig teaches that a client computer communicates directly with a printer to get status information, but Leurig does not teach or suggest transmitting address information (*e.g.*, web address information) to the client computer from a server to cause the client computer to acquire the status information from the printer.

Instead, Leurig teaches that the server acts to verify that a client computer is authorized to print on a particular printer (*see, e.g.*, paragraph [0046]), such as

by requesting a serial number or other identifying information from the printer (see, e.g., paragraph [0046]). If it is determined that the client computer is authorized, then the server also transmits a data file including a print job to the client computer (see, e.g., paragraphs [0047]-[0048]), with the client computer then providing the file to the printer for printing. However, nowhere in any of these transmissions does Leurig teach or suggest that that address information is transmitted to the client computer from the server. Indeed, it considered that one of ordinary skill in the art would understand that the user would instead need to preliminarily register such address information to obtain status information from the printer on the client computer, according to the system of Leurig, as the address information is not otherwise taught as being transmitted to the client computer.

It can be further understood from viewing the figures of Leurig why it would not be necessary to provide the transmission of address information from a server to a client computer in the system of Leurig, to cause the client computer to acquire print status information. This is because, as seen for example in Figs. 2-3 of Leurig, the printer 110 appears to be directly connected to the client computer 108, as opposed to having the client computer being connected to the printer via an intermediary server. Thus, the system of Leurig has no need for providing address information to the client computer to circumvent an intermediary server, and obtain direct communications between the client computer and printer, because the printer and client computer are already directly connected.

Furthermore, as Leurig does not teach or suggest transmitting address

information to a client device to cause the device to acquire a printing state without going through a server, it follows therefrom that Leurig also does not teach or suggest causing the client device to display the printing state automatically in accordance with the address information. Accordingly, the method of claim 1 is not obvious over the teachings of Leurig.

Simpson does not make up for the deficiencies of Leurig. Simpson teaches a printing system having a client computer and a printer that allows a user of the computer to download Web content provided by the printer (*see, e.g.*, Abstract). In particular, Simpson teaches that the printer includes a program that provides print service (PS) Web content 136 that enables a client to print a document (*see, e.g.*, paragraphs [0036]-[0037]). Simpson further teaches that the PS Web content 136 is capable of displaying a web page (e.g., “help page”) including a hyperlink (e.g., “help link”) (*see, e.g.*, paragraphs [0054]-[0055]), which a user can select to “obtain assistance to resolve the printer alert condition that has occurred” (paragraph [0054]), such as for example by launching an e-mail dialog box with an individual who can provide assistance (*see, e.g.*, paragraph [0057]). Thus, Simpson teaches providing a hyperlink (e.g., helplink) that includes address information (i.e., a web address), and which may be selected by a user to obtain assistance in resolving an alert condition of a printer. However, Simpson does not teach or suggest transmitting address information for causing the client device to acquire a state of processing of the transmitted print data, because Simpson does not teach or suggest that the helplink provides such printing state information.

It is furthermore noted that Simpson teaches that the hyperlink (helplink)

provided by the PS web content 136 must be selected by a user to access the help information/functions provided thereby (see, e.g., paragraphs [0054]-[0055]). It follows therefrom that Simpson also does not teach or suggest a step of causing a client device to automatically display the printing state in accordance with the address information, as in the claim, because the information provided by the hyperlink is not automatically displayed, but instead must be selected for display by a user, such as for example by highlighting and selecting the hyperlink with a cursor or other selecting means.

Accordingly, as neither Leurig nor Simpson teach or suggest the method as claimed that includes transmitting address information for causing the client device to acquire a state of processing of the transmitted print data, and automatically displaying the printing state in accordance with the address information, it is considered that claim 1 is patentable over the combined teachings of the references. Claims 2-5 depend from claim 1, and thus are also patentable over the references for at least the same reasons as their base claim.

Claim 8 is directed to an information processing device capable of communicating with an external device and a printer device through a network, the external device being different from the printer device, the information processing device comprising:

“a request receiving unit configured to receive a printing request from the external device;

a data transmission unit configured to transmit print data to the printer device selected in the external device in accordance with the printing request received by the request receiving unit;

a transmission unit configured to transmit, to the external device, address information for causing the external device to acquire, from the printer device without going through the information processing apparatus, a state of processing of the print data transmitted by the data transmission unit, and a control unit configured to cause the external device to display the state automatically in accordance with the address information" (emphasis added).

Thus, the information processing device as recited in claim 8 may be capable of performing steps that are the same as and/or similar to those performed in the method of claim 1. Accordingly, claim 8 is considered to be patentable over the teachings of Leurig and Simpson for reasons that are the same as and/or similar to those discussed above for claim 1, and in particular as neither of the references teaches or suggests a transmission unit that transmits address information for causing the external device to acquire a state of processing of the transmitted print data, nor a control unit that causes the external device to automatically display the printing state in accordance with the address information. Claims 9-12 depend from claim 8, and thus are also patentable over the teachings of Leurig and Simpson for at least the same reasons as their base claim.

Claim 13 is directed to a computer-readable medium having a program stored thereon for controlling a computer of a server capable of communicating with an external device and a printer device, the external device being different from the printer device, the program causing the computer to execute a method that is the same as and/or similar to the method of claim 1. Accordingly, claim 13 is considered to be patentable over the teachings of Leurig and Simpson for at

least the same reasons as claim 1, and in particular as the references do not teach or suggest transmitting address information for causing the external device to acquire a state of processing of the transmitted print data, and automatically display the printing state in accordance with the address information, as in the claim. Claims 14-17 depend from claim 13, and thus are also patentable over the teachings of Leurig and Simpson for at least the same reasons as their base claim.

Accordingly, claims 1-5 and 8-17 are patentable over the teachings of Leurig and Simpson, and the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over these references is respectfully requested to be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims pending in the application meet the requirements for patentability, and respectfully requests that the Examiner indicate the allowance of such claims. Any amendments to the claims which have been made in this response, and which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

If any additional fee is required, please charge Deposit Account Number 502456. Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner may contact Applicant's representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

2/11/2010

Date

/Abigail Cotton/

Abigail Cotton, Reg. No. 52,773
Patent Agent for Applicant

Canon U.S.A. Inc., Intellectual Property Division
15975 Alton Parkway
Irvine, CA 92618-3731

Telephone: (949) 932-3351
Fax: (949) 932-3560